

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated October 16, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-13 were pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein; and claims 14-17 have been added. No new matter has been introduced by the new claims added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner suggested amending claim 12 to recite "a computer readable medium storing computer readable instructions." Although the Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion, claim 12 has been canceled thereby rendering the above rejection to that claim under 35 U.S.C. 101 moot.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (U.S. Patent No. 7,082,571, hereafter "Ikeda"); claims 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Burgess (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,790); claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda; and claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Endo (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,493).

As noted above, claims 1-13 have been canceled thereby rendering the above prior art rejections to those claims moot. Additionally, the Applicants assert that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in new independent claims 14 and 17. For example, claim 14 recites the following features:

“[a] guidance display device, comprising:

a first display region in which to display contents;

a second display region other than said first display region;

a guidance contents holding unit configured to hold first guidance display contents and second guidance display contents, the first guidance display contents corresponding to said first display region on a one-to-one basis and indicating processing for operating contents displayed in said first display region, and the second guidance display contents corresponding to said second

display region on a one-to-one basis and indicating processing for operating contents displayed in said second display region;

a guidance synthesis unit configured to synthesize the first guidance display contents and the second guidance display contents; and

a display unit configured to display, on a screen, the contents displayed in said first and said second display regions and guidance contents synthesized by said guidance synthesis unit.”

The features noted above in claim 14 are similarly recited in independent claim 17. Specifically, independent claim 17 is a corresponding method claim reciting steps directed to the features of device of claim 14. Additionally, the features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see e.g., Fig. 5).

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 14 and 17) is distinguishable over the cited prior art that in the device and method of the present invention provide a guidance display which can appropriately display the guidance display contents according to changes in operational specification and so on. The present invention can achieve such an object by synthesizing the first and the second guidance display contents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied primarily on Ikeda for disclosing or suggesting all the features of the independent claims of the present invention. However, the Applicants assert that Ikeda fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of independent claims 14 and 17.

Ikeda discloses a technique, relating to a map display device, for specifying a route on the map and displaying the area having a predetermined width of the specified route clearly and the other area less clearly. In the Office Action, the Examiner considered the guidance display contents described in the present invention as corresponding to the route on the map disclosed in Ikeda.

However, the present invention (as recited in claims 14 and 17) now includes the use of a first and second guidance display contents indicating processing for operating the contents displayed in the display region (which are represented, for example, by up-arrow, right-arrow, soft key, or status display illustrated in FIG. 5 of the present application). Accordingly, the first

or the second guidance display contents of the present invention are completely different from a mere route on the map disclosed in Ikeda. Additionally, the present invention (as recited in claims 14 and 17) can appropriately display the guidance display contents according to changes in operational specification by synthesizing the first and the second guidance display contents. No such features are believed to be disclosed or suggested by Ikeda.

Moreover, after a detailed review of Burgess and Endo, the references fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Ikeda. Accordingly, Ikeda, Burgess and Endo (individually or in combination) fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 14 and 17. Additionally, Ikeda, Burgess and Endo (individually or in combination) fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 15 and 16 by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 14.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideaki YAJIMA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2009.01.13 15:53:20 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 13, 2009